REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro, dated 9 Mar 2005.

Claims 3, 10, and 23 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11-22, without prejudice, have amended claims 3 and 10, and have introduced new claim 23.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of a question that the claims are directed to an abstract idea.

Applicants have amended claims 3 and 10 and introduced new claim 23, each drafted so as to clarify that the invention is tied to a computer and its components, which

LOT920010028US1   10 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916

together form a technological art and result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis for the terms "said current view" or "said hide-when flag".

Applicant has canceled these claims.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-7, 10-19, 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over DeJean, Revealing the Hidden Secrets of "hide when".

Applicant has canceled claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-19, and 22.

With respect to claims 3 and 10, applicant has amended the claims to clarify that their invention is directed to

LOT920010028US1   11 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916

selecting based on document properties actions for display in an action bar of a graphical user interface dynamically as a user moves through a view, from one document to another.

DeJean, on the other hand, is describing hide-when's as they apply inside a document. The DeJean article is all about hiding elements inside the document, such as paragraphs, tables, commands, fields, based on various conditions. However, nowhere does DeJean teach dynamic evaluation of actions for display in an action bar of a view as the user navigates between documents.

DeJean's "edit actions" is a term described on page 5 to define a button inside a document and the action that needs to take place when the user clicks on the button. This is not the same as actions which are presented in the action bar of a view. Applicant's claims are directed to selectively hiding actions in the action bar of a view dynamically based on the properties of a next document selected by the user for display in that view.

DeJean, at page 1 lines 31-35, refers to hide-when's allowing to manipulate what appears in the UI based on the

LOT920010028US1   12 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916

state, properties, or contents of a document, but this is static as referred to by lines 25-30. There is no mention of dynamically evaluating the actions to be displayed in the action bar of a view based on document properties.

The Examiner seems to suggest that DeJean, at page 2, lines 1-3, is implying dynamic operation. DeJean states:

> "Check any of the boxes, and the paragraph containing the object will be hidden when that condition exists. The options on this tab have become more elaborate as Notes features have proliferated..."

Applicant asserts that, at least as set forth in the amended claims, there is no teaching here by DeJean of dynamic operation, in the sense of dynamically determining those actions to be presented in the action bar of a view based on formulas which reference document properties as the user navigates between documents.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35

LOT920010028US1   13 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916

U.S.C. 103 over DeJean in view of Sams, <u>Teach Yourself Lotus</u>

<u>Notes...</u> (hereinafter, Sams).

Applicants have canceled claims 8, 9, 20, and 21.

Further, Sams Fig. 5.6 on page 68 mentions a document, but

does not mention any of its contents. It mentions the

unread/read state of the document. However, there is no

teaching in Sams of referencing the document contents to

dynamically configure the view action bar as the user

navigates between documents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered

and the case passed to issue with claims 3, 10, and 23.

The Application is believed to be in condition for

allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should

differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of

the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number

provided below for the purpose of providing constructive

LOT920010028US1   14 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916

assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P.

Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims

can be presented, thereby placing the Application in

condition for allowance without further proceedings being

necessary.

Sincerely,

Rajesh V. Patil

By

Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 7 May 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Patent Attorney
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545

LOT920010028US1   15 OF 15   S/N 10/045,916